

**NAS ALAMEDA RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

N00236.001289  
ALAMEDA POINT  
SSIC NO. 5090.3

**NAS Alameda Officer's Club  
NAS Alameda, California**

**Tuesday, August 1, 1995  
REVISED**

**ATTENDEES**

See attached list.

**MEETING SUMMARY**

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

**I. Introduction and Minutes**

Ken O'Donoghue, community co-chair, reviewed the evening's agenda and asked for comments on the July 11 meetings minutes. The minutes were approved with the following changes.

- On page 6, paragraph 2, the meeting minutes indicate that a question by Malcolm Mooney was inaudible. Malcolm said he didn't recall his question, and suggested that the minutes continue to state that the question and answer were inaudible.
- The word VARCO should be changed to UARCO in each instance.
- Page 15, the reference to Wayne ? should be replaced with Wayne Mayer.

**II. Co-Chair Announcements**

Ken O'Donoghue pointed out that the agenda style has been changed to (1) include a description of the topics to be discussed and (2) use site names, numbers, and descriptions instead of just site numbers.

Ken also told all focus group chairpersons to remain in the room at the end of the meeting to establish a date for the chairpersons to meet. The purpose of the meeting is to revisit the idea of using focus group chairs as an executive board.

Ken also announced that Kathy Teller is taking a 3-month leave of absence from the restoration advisory board (RAB).

LCDR Petouhoff, because he was unable to attend the July RAB meeting, provided response to questions and concerns which the minutes indicated could not be addressed until he returned.

- The minutes indicated unanswered questions and concerns regarding the budget; he indicated he would make a presentation on the budget at tonight's meeting.
- In response to concerns noted in the minutes regarding the least tern buffer zone study, LCDR Petouhoff said comments have been sent in and the revised report is expected to be released at the end of August. He suggested meeting with interested persons to review the study and to discuss how to coordinate with the BRAG on the release of the study and understanding the significance of the information in it.
- In response to Tom Okey's question on page 13 of the July RAB minutes asking why the report was released to a city agency but not the general public, LCDR Petouhoff explained that the report was released to the Alameda Reuse and Redevelopment Agency (ARRA) because it is the joint powers authority recognized by the Department of Defense as having the authority to determine the reuse.

LCDR Petouhoff thanked Mariette Shin for her service to NAS Alameda and the RAB during her internship and indicated tonight will be Mariette's last RAB meeting.

Karen Hack suggested that the Alameda RAB institute a mechanism for identifying and tracking action items generated at one meeting and ensuring they are followed up at the next meeting. She described the mechanism used by the Treasure Island RAB which involves (1) recording action items (or questions needing follow-up) on a flip chart during the meeting, (2) reading the list at the end of the meeting to ensure everyone agrees what is expected, (3) beginning the next meeting with the follow-up action, and (4) tracking action items until follow-up is provided or a decision is made to eliminate/change the action item.

Ken O'Donoghue said this is being done informally, but agreed a formal mechanism could be instituted. RAB members favored instituting the mechanism immediately.

### **III. Workshop Report Back**

Roberta Hough discussed some of the information presented at the July 22 geology workshop. She explained that the soil types occurring at NAS Alameda can be grouped into three types: Bay Mud, Merritt Sand, and Yerba Buena Mud. She showed a geologic cross-section of a transect and explained the consequences of a spill of solvent in this type of geologic environment: in an area of Merritt Sand, which is porous, the solvent would travel and it would travel toward the Seaplane Lagoon because of the land slope. In an area containing mud, the solvent would not be able to travel far and, thus, would be easier to remove. She showed a second cross-section from a different transect to illustrate that in some areas we don't have enough data to have fully characterized the geology. Mariette Shin added that not all available data were included on the cross-sections provided at the workshop in order to simplify the graphics for the purpose of the workshop.

Sherri Withrow indicated she has a video tape of the workshop for people to borrow. Michael Torres asked if copies of the video tape would be put in the library for use by community members. Sherri responded that she keeps all video tapes in her office in order to track who has them; she invited anyone, not just RAB members, to contact her to borrow the tape of this and other workshops.

LCDR Petouhoff thanked Mariette Shin for her efforts in putting the workshop together and Tom Lanphar for helping to provide the vision for the workshop.

#### **IV. Budget Update**

Congress has not yet finalized the 1996 budget, so LCDR Petouhoff's presentation focused on what has happened in the Executive Branch thus far regarding the 1996 budget. The first slide of the presentation compared the required funding for BRAC bases to actual funding received. He pointed out that for BRAC round I and II bases, the funding requirement was very close to the funding received. BRAC round III, which includes NAS Alameda, was the largest BRAC round (highest number of bases designated for closure); consequently, there are a lot more bases competing for money and the gap between needed funding and funding received has gotten much larger.

Next, LCDR Petouhoff explained that the "banding" concept was an attempt to allocate money when there isn't enough to meet all funding requirements. He presented a slide that defined the bands. In general, he said, banding uses the status of the community's reuse plan. He explained that discussions have occurred with those who put the banding concept together to explain that status of a community reuse plan alone isn't the best indicator. For one thing, a reuse plan doesn't exist for NAS Alameda, but a lot of reuse activity is occurring. Secondly, if one prioritizes bases on reuse only, there may be some human and ecological risk issues not being addressed; similarly if one looks only at human and ecological risk issues, it would neglect meeting the needs of the reuse plan. LCDR Petouhoff's projection is that the prioritization scheme used in the long term will include some of both aspects.

Because it currently lacks a reuse plan, NAS Alameda looks low on the banding scale. He pointed out, however, that most BRAC 3 bases wouldn't have a reuse plan, yet in 1996 most will have a reuse plan so most will fall in Band 1.

A RAB member asked what band NAS Alameda falls into; LCDR Petouhoff responded that we have projects in Bands 1, 2, 3 and 4. The whole budget doesn't move up and down; projects move up and down the banding scale.

The budget President Clinton submitted to Congress on behalf of NAS Alameda shows \$13.7 million; the requirement was \$21 million. Next LCDR Petouhoff showed a slide including what NAS Alameda has spent annually since 1993 on the IR Program and compliance. He reminded people of the July 11 RAB presentation on the budget when it was explained that most of the building blocks for a record of decision were funded in these previous years. Current funding requirements are related to removal actions and other activities.

Roberta Hough said she recalls last year's presentation on the budget when LCDR Petouhoff explained that the Secretary of the Navy didn't give to the Executive Branch the full amount requested by the bases. LCDR Petouhoff explained that all components within the Executive Branch put together aggregate budgets. When the President submits a budget to Congress, he has to show some efforts toward deficit reduction so he has to do some paring down so it isn't extraordinarily different than last year's. His cabinet members have to do the same, so within the Department of Defense, the Secretaries of the Navy, Army, and Air Force have to submit a budget that isn't much different than last year's. That's what affects BRAC III; the Secretary of the Navy has to have a budget similar to last year's so he has to decide where to cut -- ship's fuel, cleanup. Roberta asked if that means the Navy's budget includes weapons systems and cleanup in the aggregate. LCDR Petouhoff answered, yes, it is all federal requirements.

Doug De Haan asked if banding is the accepted method that will continue to be used. LCDR Petouhoff replied that while it was used in submitting the budget; the base is not necessarily constrained to it in execution. Doug added that his concern is in regard to dates; the final reuse plan is expected in 1996 but that could be in the July/August timeframe. By then, the budget would already be submitted and NAS Alameda would still be in Band 3. LCDR Petouhoff said there are two things they are trying to communicate to Washington.

- (1) The status of the reuse plan doesn't necessarily indicate the level of reuse activity. NAS Alameda has a lot of reuse activity but no reuse plan. So we could have more important reuse activity coming up than someone who does have a reuse plan. EPA agrees with this.
- (2) Alameda has two reuse plans: an approved interim plan which covers 10 years and a long-term plan. LCDR Petouhoff indicated there isn't anything he needs to know right now about reuse that isn't in the interim plan. Down the road there are decisions that need to be made that depend on the long-term plan, but we're communicating to them that we do have a reuse plan.

LCDR Petouhoff added that they haven't yet had a project they couldn't get funded.

A RAB member asked the definition of IR used on the slides. LCDR Petouhoff responded that IR stands for Installation Restoration; it is the Navy's implementation of CERCLA.

Lyn Stirewalt, in regard to the slide showing funding for compliance, asked how many of those activities have been done. LCDR Petouhoff said all funded projects have been executed; last year's compliance budget went for 69 tank pulls, asbestos survey of the base, asbestos abatement where we have reuse interest, the environmental baseline survey (EBS) and EBS sampling, and FOSL work.

Karen Hack asked, if the banding concept is accepted and NAS Alameda doesn't have a final reuse plan by October 1996, what will next year's budget for NAS Alameda look like. LCDR Petouhoff replied that he doesn't really know yet, but he sees numbers as low as \$1 and 2 million.

Karen asked if that money would be earmarked for specific projects or would the BCT have the ability to decide how to use that money. LCDR Petouhoff said the BCT has the discretion for the base.

## **V. Removal Actions Status**

### **Site 16 - CANS area near Encinal High School.**

LCDR Petouhoff introduced Dr. Akali Igbene of Moju Environmental Technologies and pointed out that Moju is a local business enterprise.

Dr. Igbene provided copies of his presentation slides as a handout. The handout describes the removal action process for Site 16, a conceptual model and map of Site 16, background information on Site 16, chemical data related to chemicals of concern at Site 16, descriptions and graphics of the removal action alternatives considered for Site 16, the results of the evaluation of each alternative, and a removal action schedule.

Points made by Dr. Igbene that are not specifically illustrated on the handout and questions asked by RAB members are summarized below.

Dr. Igbene explained how the chemicals of concern (or risk drivers) were determined. He said they looked at all chemical data for Site 16 (the frequency, the concentration, and how widespread) and compared the highest results to what the EPA considers to be toxic (on the handouts they are listed as preliminary remediation goals [PRGs]). Based on this analysis, PCBs and lead were determined to be chemicals of concern at Site 16. They calculate that if they remove lead above 300 ppm, the residual lead will be less than 130 ppm thereby significantly reducing the risk. For PCBs, if PCBs above 1.0 ppm are removed, the residual level after the removal action will be between 0.066-0.34 ppm, significantly reducing risk. The handout lists the PRGs for lead and PCBs and shows that residual levels will meet PRGs.

The lead is found in the top 1 foot of soil.

Jim Haas asked how the lead concentrations are distributed at the site. Dr. Igbene said there are two lead hot spots.

Most of the PCB data were non-detects, but for some PCBs the detection limits are very high, so the graphs show the detection limits. The average concentration of PCBs (non-detects are included in the average) is 8.376. After the removal action, the average is expected to be 0.210.

Once the soil is removed, it is stockpiled. Options are to treat the soil at Site 16, treat it elsewhere on the base in a corrective action management unit (CAMU), or transported it off site. Because Site 16 is next to the high school, it is preferable to stockpile the soil in a CAMU. Tom Lanphar, DTSC, said the CAMU is one possibility, and the BCT has not yet decided. If it is called something other than a CAMU in the future, don't be surprised. LCDR Petouhoff mentioned that the value of stockpiling is that when similarly contaminated soil is removed elsewhere on base, it becomes more economical to treat larger quantities of soil rather than the small amount removed from just Site 16.

Lyn Stirewalt asked whether, after removing 1 foot of soil, you will remove additional soil. LCDR Petouhoff explained that after removing 1 foot of soil, confirmation samples will be collected; if those results reveal high concentrations in an area, additional excavation will occur.

Malcolm Mooney asked what input Dr. Igbene expected to receive during the public notice period. Dr. Igbene said he didn't know; publishing a public notice is a legal requirement.

A RAB member asked whether the excavation will be backfilled with treated soil or clean soil. LCDR Petouhoff said, given the location of the site next to the high school, it is best to use clean backfill and doing so doesn't increase the cost much.

Tom Okey commented that Site 16 is a multi-chemical system, but only two chemicals are being looked at in the analysis for the removal action. In theory the treatment goals may underestimate the risk that was used to create the PRGs because of possible additivity of the chemicals.

Dr. Igbene answered that he hears two questions. First, once we take the soil out and replace it with clean fill, it doesn't really matter for that site. Where the removed soil is disposed of becomes an issue. In regards to the additivity of lead and PCBs, this was considered in determining the cleanup level. The data show that to get the risk number down requires targeting PCBs, because it is the high PCB that is driving up the risk number. Tom said he also wanted to point out that if you're just

excavating for lead hot spots (over 300 ppm), you'll still have large areas that are above the EPA PRGs of 130 ppm, it's that the whole area at that horizon is averaged out to a much lower number; it's a spatial numbers game you're playing. Dr. Igbene responded that risk assessments look at concentration and the quantity of soil. LCDR Petouhoff said additivity is addressed in the risk assessment performed later. The analysis presented tonight was for determining the extent of the removal. The risk assessment assumes there is additivity and it does a chemical-specific analysis to see if the same chemicals have the same action mechanism on the same types of organisms. Tom added that from an ecological perspective it doesn't have to be the same action mechanism because you're talking about entire organisms.

A RAB member said that the removal action aims at two chemicals although there are two pages of chemicals. What is the fate of all these other chemicals if you backfill with this dirt. Dr. Igbene pointed out the levels of these other chemicals are very, very, very, low. He also clarified that the site will be backfilled with imported soil.

Tom Lanphar, DTSC, said the PRG column is very important. He used the example of methyl chloride and suggested that because it was detected in only 38 samples of 61 and the level is so low, it's possibly a laboratory artifact. Roberta Hough called attention to the fact that the use of methyl chloride was so widespread on base, it's not necessarily a laboratory contaminant. Tom Lanphar agreed but pointed out that the low concentration detected is so far below the PRGs that it's not an issue.

Tom Lanphar discussed the subject of stockpiling, saying that because the site is close to the high school they prefer to get the removed soil away from the site as soon as possible and treat it elsewhere. The proposed treatment/stockpiling area is near Site 15. They're considering a location near Site 15 because it has soil with similar contamination. Vendors try various treatment methods. The point is that the soil may be in the stockpile for some time before it is effectively treated. Malcolm Mooney said, "so what," to treat small piles such as 2,000 cubic yards separately costs a lot more than to stockpile it near Site 15 where it isn't a problem and combine it with other contaminated soil to treat a larger volume. LCDR Petouhoff said they are trying to meet the community's request to not send soil off site. They also don't want to treat it at Site 16 because of the sensitivity of the location. He restated Malcolm's point that stockpiling allows the advantage of economy of scale. But he added that they will remain sensitive to cost so as to not allow the stockpile to become too large.

Kent Rosenblum reminded the RAB of Bill Smith's concern that soil may be stockpiled with the intent to treat it under this year's budget, but what happens if two years down the line when you're ready to treat it, the money has been spent elsewhere. LCDR Petouhoff said this can be handled through incremental funding of projects funded in 1994. Tom Lanphar summarized that the idea of stockpiling still needs to be considered more fully.

Doug De Haan asked if any of the Site 16 contamination is under asphalt, and if so will the asphalt be taken up. LCDR Petouhoff answered that the removal action will involve removing asphalt, and if the asphalt surface will still be used, it will be repaired.

Karen Hack pointed out that Dr. Igbene's handout lists background numbers, but the BCT hasn't established background concentrations. Tom Lanphar said these are a reference based on a statistical analysis of metals, but it is not an established background level. Tom Okey asked Tom Lanphar if that means that background is now defined as the average contaminated area. Tom Lanphar, LCDR Petouhoff, and Ken O'Donoghue simultaneously answered "no." LCDR Petouhoff explained that

Moju is having to do some analysis in the absence of a formal risk assessment and these numbers allow that analysis.

Lyn Stirewalt said the steel plate used to be throughout the area; was sampling done throughout the area including under asphalt? LCDR Petouhoff nodded "yes."

Karen Hack asked if a full metals suite would be run on confirmation samples. Dr. Igbene answered no.

### **Site 18 - Storm Sewer System**

Teresa Bernhard's presentation addressed (1) the storm water and waste water systems, (2) treatment of bilge water, and (3) removal action of the Site 18 storm sewer system. She explained that, as a result of the Clean Water Act, NAS Alameda discontinued the practice of discharging industrial water to the bay and separated the storm drain system from the industrial sewer system. Currently the base monitors storm water run off to ensure it isn't getting too much oil and grease from cars into the storm drain system and eventually into the bay. The base also ensures that no industrial drains are connected to the industrial sewer system, rather than the storm drain system, so the industrial waste water gets treated by East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD).

Bilge water is water that leaks off oily engines and collects in the bilge (near the bottom) of a ship. Bilge water used to be removed into donuts, but NAS Alameda has developed a prototype program that transmits bilge water to an oil/water separator that removes metals; the resulting water is sent to EBMUD so it never enters the bay.

Investigations have shown residual contamination in the Site 18 storm sewer system as a result of industrial waste disposal through this system prior to the Clean Water Act. Teresa proceeded to describe the removal action planned for Site 18, which will include a camera survey to check the integrity of the lines, power washing the lines, doing another camera survey, and handling the resulting water and solids. The water can hopefully be treated by the base's industrial treatment system. The solids will be analyzed for concentration levels and quantity, and the options to manage the solids will be researched.

Teresa added that UC Berkeley is investigating the Seaplane Lagoon to identify treatment options. She called everyone's attention to the Water Front Actions fact sheet she distributed at tonight's meeting.

Tom Okey asked what the lines are made of. Teresa said they range in size from 4 to 36 inches in diameter; the psi used in the power wash will be varied depending on diameter. The lines are constructed of PVC and concrete. She reminded everyone that a camera survey will be done first to ensure no leaking or collapsed pipes exist; if damaged lines are identified, compliance personnel will already be in place to repair the lines so the removal action can proceed.

Karen Hack asked if any groundwater infiltration into the lines has occurred. Teresa said the storm water monitoring work that will begin next week will evaluate that. Karen asked if the annual groundwater monitoring reports suggest any infiltration. Teresa said she doesn't have those results. LCDR Petouhoff said he does have those results but he isn't prepared to report on them tonight. Karen asked if a summary of this information can be available at the next RAB meeting. LCDR Petouhoff said this may depend on the agenda and whether the compliance information has relevance to cleanup since this is not a forum for discussing compliance issues.

Doug De Haan asked what testing will be done of the industrial waste water system. LCDR Petouhoff said the EBS is looking at that system and will sample if necessary.

Tom Lanphar asked Teresa if there are any thoughts on treatment and disposal; she said it's too early to even guess, it'll depend on the concentrations and quantities. Lyn Stirewalt asked what documentation will be involved in the Site 18 removal action. Teresa said that no documentation is available yet. The removal action is considered time-critical so there won't be an engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA). The RAB will see the document produced but there won't be a formal comment period. The document is expected in the middle or end of August, and the removal is to occur in October. In response to a question, Teresa said the removal action is funded through cleanup (rather than compliance) money. Tom Lanphar explained that although there won't be a 30-day comment period on the documentation, the public will have 30 days to comment on the State's CEQA documentation prior to the removal action. LCDR Petouhoff said the schedule is expedited to try to do the removal before the next rainy season.

## **VI. Ecological Update**

In consideration of time constraints, Teresa Bernhard referred RAB members to the handout titled, "Status of Ecological Work at NAS Alameda," August 1995, and instructed people to call her (415) 244-2596 or George Kikugawa with questions.

Tom Lanphar told the group that he was still looking into using the Biological Technical Advisory Group (BTAG). The BTAG is a group of regulators who work together to develop consistent approaches among regulators and contractors to ecological assessments in the Bay Area. Jim Haas, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, added to the description of the BTAG, indicating it is an advisory body not a policy-making body. Tom Okey said the Natural Resources Focus Group has concerns about what will be included in the follow-on work and how the RAB can have input on the issue now.

## **VII. Focus Group Reports**

### **Technology Focus Group**

A joint focus group meeting is tentatively planned for September 12 to discuss the Seaplane Lagoon. In the meantime all Technology Focus Group members are advised to set in on other focus group meetings.

### **Public Outreach Focus Group**

Karen King and Sharon Bayle have offered to take over the focus group from Corinne Stefanick. Ken O'Donoghue thanked them for their willingness to do the job.

### **Organizational Focus Group**

Lyn Stirewalt distributed the draft charter and asked everyone to provide her with comments. Comments received on the previous draft have been incorporated. She said a draft mission statement will be distributed by mail for comment. She also distributed a letter sent to the Office of Deputy Under Secretary of Defense on the proposed rule regarding technical assistance grants.

The focus group also reviewed Wayne Mayer's layouts and graphics for business cards. Lyn offered the focus group's assistance in tracking action items.



### Natural Resources Focus Group

Tom Okey handed out a summary of the group's activities. He mentioned a 3-day EPA workshop on risk he attended recently. He said the workshop was very good and was a dramatic contrast to the little risk communication "shindig" the Navy put on and suggested the Navy pay attention to the EPA classes.

Jim Haas, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, said he talked to Jim Browning on the least tern buffer zone study, who has reviewed and commented on the document and said there may be text changes to the document but there doesn't need to be any concern about the study's scientific integrity. He said Jim Browning is the endangered species biologist and is also working with the reuse authority on the least tern issue.

Karen Hack said ARC Ecology will be requesting the least tern buffer zone study under the Freedom of Information Act. She also mentioned that there is currently a bill in Congress threatening to reduce funding for technical assistance grants and limit a group's ability to choose its own independent consultant. Members should call her for more information on this subject.

### Reuse Focus Group

No report.

### Early Action Focus Group

Kent Rosenblum said members at the meeting discussed keeping track of early actions at reuse parcels, such as Parcel 144. LCDR Petouhoff said he wants to get in touch with people who had concerns. Malcolm Mooney added that it will take months before the surface can be made ready for soccer play.

Sherri Withrow asked Stacey Lupton to update the RAB on the community interviews for the community relations plan. Stacey said the interviews have provided a great deal of information on how to best inform and involve the public and generate interest. She said it has also become very clear that there isn't a connection between the RAB and the larger community, and it will be very important to devise a strategy to change that. Some members made suggestions and Stacey emphasized the need for them to write down all their suggestions on the questionnaire distributed to them for that purpose and return the questionnaires to her or Sherri as soon as possible.

The October RAB meeting will be held the second Tuesday of the month to avoid conflicting with religious holidays.

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

The next meeting is Tuesday, September 5, 1995, at 7 p.m. in the Officer's Club at NAS Alameda.

### ACTION ITEMS

- 8/1 Results of annual storm water monitoring report (Karen Hack)
- 8/1 RAB members should complete the community relations plan questionnaire within the next 2 weeks (Sherri Withrow/Stacey Lupton)
- 8/1 Source of clean fill for Site 16 (Lyn Stirewalt)
- 8/1 Training on the concept of addressing multiple chemical effects (Lyn Stirewalt)
- 8/1 Updates on one-time compliance and transfer-related compliance actions (Lyn Stirewalt)
- 8/1 Background concentrations (Roberta Hough)
- 8/1 Direct measurement of tissue residues in organisms (Tom Okey)
- 8/1 Compliance issues should be within the purview of the RAB (Karen Hack)